

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Patent Application

5 Applicant(s): Basson et al.
Docket No.: YOR920000840US1
Serial No.: 09/822,703
Filing Date: March 30, 2001
Group: 2145
10 Examiner: Adnan M. Mirza

Title: Prioritization of Networks for Preferred Groups

15

REPLY BRIEF

Mail Stop Appeal Brief – Patents
Commissioner for Patents
20 P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:
25

Appellants hereby reply to the Examiner's Answer, mailed November 28, 2007 (referred to hereinafter as "the Examiner's Answer"), in an Appeal of the final rejection of claims 1-50 in the above-identified patent application.

30

REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in Appellants' Appeal Brief.

RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

35

A statement identifying related appeals is contained in Appellants' Appeal Brief.

STATUS OF CLAIMS

A statement identifying the status of the claims is contained in Appellants' Appeal Brief.

5

STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

A statement identifying the status of the amendments is contained in Appellants' Appeal Brief.

10

SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

A Summary of the Invention is contained in Appellants' Appeal Brief.

STATEMENT OF GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

A statement identifying the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is contained in Appellants' Appeal Brief.

15

CLAIMS APPEALED

A copy of the appealed claims is contained in an Appendix of Appellants' Appeal Brief.

20

ARGUMENT

Response to Examiner's Answer

Point A

The Examiner alleges that Anderson discloses configuring a network to assign a higher priority to the network information when the network information is assigned to one or more *preferred groups* at page 4, paragraph [0039].

25

As previously noted, Anderson does *not* disclose or suggest configuring a network to assign a higher priority to the network information when the network information is assigned to one or more *preferred groups*. The present disclosure teaches that "preferred groups are those *groups of individuals* that are *allowed to prioritize their communications* over a network." (Page 4, lines 11-12; emphasis added.) Anderson

30

does *not* disclose or suggest that preferred groups are *groups of individuals*, and does *not* disclose or suggest that preferred groups are *allowed to prioritize their communications*.

Point B

Regarding the limitation “priorities are utilized for configuring a network to assign a higher priority to the network information when the network information is assigned to one or more preferred groups,” the Examiner asserts that Schuster discloses “a selected low priority level would block calls from certain individuals, which calls from other individuals may be deemed important enough to set a high enough priority level to interrupt the business meeting.”

Appellants note that, as the Examiner acknowledges, the priority level disclosed by Schuster is utilized for determining *how received calls are handled* (blocked or allowed to interrupt a business meeting, etc.). For example, Schuster teaches that,

in another embodiment, the user 220 may use the PID 210 to configure the voice communication device 208 to screen calls based on priority levels set for individuals for whom the user 220 has provided an entry in an address book.
(Col. 10, line 65, to col. 11, line 1; emphasis added.)

Thus, the call handling is provided by the voice communication device 208. Schuster also teaches that voice communication device 208 is attached to the network (FIG. 2), but does *not disclose or suggest that voice communication device 208 is an element of the network*. Thus, Schuster does *not* disclose or suggest that the priorities are utilized for *configuring a network*, and does *not* disclose or suggest that the priorities are utilized for *configuring a network to assign a higher priority to the network information when the network information is assigned to one or more preferred groups*, as would be apparent to a person of ordinary skill in the art.

Point C

Regarding the limitation “priorities are utilized for configuring a network to assign a higher priority to the network information,” the Examiner cites page 11, paragraph [0152] of Anderson and asserts that one of ordinary skill in the art would know that the “network information is also interpreted as transmission packets and the order of transmission packets is also relate [SIC.] as prioritize network information.”

Appellants maintain, however, that Anderson does *not* disclose or suggest configuring a network to assign a higher priority to the network information when the network information is assigned to one or more *preferred groups*. The present disclosure teaches that “preferred groups are those *groups of individuals* that are *allowed to*
5 *prioritize their communications* over a network.” (Page 4, lines 11-12; emphasis added.) Anderson does *not* disclose or suggest preferred groups that are *groups of individuals*, and does *not* disclose or suggest that preferred groups are *allowed to prioritize their communications*.

Also, as Appellants previously noted, although Anderson teaches that a
10 “method should preferably prioritize transmission according to the destination that is receiving the most important, *i.e. time critical*, information” (page 2, paragraph 14; emphasis added), the method taught by Anderson *only* requires that “destinations receiving data *from many sources* will receive *priority*.” (Page 4, paragraph 43; emphasis added.) Anderson claims that “this is effective because communication stations 30 that
15 receive traffic from many locations have been shown to be more likely to be receiving more time-critical traffic, or *to have many users*. Communication stations 30 that receive data from only a few sources have been shown to be more likely transferring large amounts of data, for which some delay is acceptable.” (Page 18, paragraph 223; emphasis added.) Contrary to Anderson’s assertion, the number of sources from which
20 data is received is *not* indicative of a time critical characteristic of the data, as would be apparent to a person of ordinary skill in the art. For example, regardless of the number of sources, video conferencing streams are *typically time critical*. Similarly, large text files are *typically not time critical*, regardless of the number of sources.

Point D

25 Regarding the limitation “marking network information associated with the individual with a priority label; and configuring a network to assign a higher priority, as compared to network information not marked with a priority label, to the marked network information,” the Examiner asserts that Schuster discloses that “the user may enter a level at the global priority level to set the priority level for all users in the address
30 book.”

As Appellants noted in the Appeal Brief, the priority level disclosed by Schuster is utilized for determining *how received calls are handled* (blocked or allowed to interrupt a business meeting, etc.). (See, col. 25, line 59, to col. 26, line 51.) Schuster does not, however, disclose or suggest determining if an individual belongs to one or more preferred groups; marking network information associated with the individual with a priority label; and configuring a network to assign a higher priority, as compared to network information not marked with a priority label, to the marked network information, as required by independent claims 17, 32, and 47.

Point E

Regarding the limitation “network information belongs to a preferred group when the input biometric data matches the stored biometric data,” the Examiner asserts that Anderson discloses this limitation at page 8, paragraph [0108].

Appellants note that “biometric” is defined as “the measurement of physical characteristics, such as fingerprints, DNA, or retinal patterns, for use in verifying the identity of individuals.” (See, dictionary.com) Appellants could find *no* disclosure or suggestion of biometric data or of determining that the network information belongs to a preferred group when the input biometric data matches the stored biometric data in Paragraph 0108 of Anderson.

Thus, Anderson and Schuster, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest determining that the network information belongs to a preferred group when the input biometric data matches the stored biometric data, as required by claims 13, 28, and 43.

Appeal Brief Arguments

Independent Claims 1, 14, 17, 21, 29, 32, 36, 44 and 47

Independent claims 1, 14, 17, 21, 29, 32, 36, 44, and 47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson and further in view of Schuster et al. Regarding claims 1, 21, and 36, the Examiner asserts that Anderson teaches a) determining if network information is assigned to one or more preferred groups; and b) configuring a network to assign a higher priority to the network

information when the network information is assigned to one or more preferred groups (page 4, paragraphs 39 and 43). The Examiner acknowledges that Anderson did not disclose in detail the “higher priority being relative to network information not assigned to one or more preferred groups,” but asserts that Schuster discloses “a selected low
5 priority level would block calls from certain individuals, which calls from other individuals may be deemed important enough to set a high enough priority level to interrupt the business meeting.” (Col. 8, lines 58-62.) The Examiner asserts that a person of ordinary skill in the art would have combined the cited references to “reduce latency by improving priority scheduling.”

10 Appellants note that, although Anderson teaches that a “method should preferably prioritize transmission according to the destination that is receiving the most important, i.e. time critical, information” (page 2, paragraph 14), the method taught by Anderson *only* requires that “destinations receiving data *from many sources* will receive *priority*.” (Page 4, paragraph 43; emphasis added.) Anderson claims that “this is
15 effective because communication stations 30 that receive traffic from many locations have been shown to be more likely to be receiving more time-critical traffic, or *to have many users*. Communication stations 30 that receive data from only a few sources have been shown to be more likely transferring large amounts of data, for which some delay is acceptable.” (Page 18, paragraph 223; emphasis added.) Contrary to Anderson’s
20 assertion, the number of sources from which data is received is *not* indicative of a time critical characteristic of the data, as would be apparent to a person of ordinary skill in the art. For example, regardless of the number of sources, video conferencing streams are *typically time critical*. Similarly, large text files are *typically not time critical*, regardless of the number of sources.

25 In any case, Anderson does *not* disclose or suggest configuring a network to assign a higher priority to the network information when the network information is assigned to one or more *preferred groups*. The present disclosure teaches that “preferred groups are those *groups of individuals* that are *allowed to prioritize their communications* over a network.” (Page 4, lines 11-12; emphasis added.) Anderson
30 does *not* disclose or suggest that preferred groups are *groups of individuals*, and does *not*

disclose or suggest that preferred groups are *allowed to prioritize their communications*.

The Examiner also acknowledges that Anderson did not disclose in detail that the “higher priority being relative to network information not assigned to one or more preferred groups,” but asserts that Schuster discloses “a selected low priority level
5 would block calls from certain individuals, which calls from other individuals may be deemed important enough to set a high enough priority level to interrupt the business meeting.”

Appellants note that, as the Examiner acknowledges, the priority level disclosed by Schuster is utilized for determining *how received calls are handled* (blocked
10 or allowed to interrupt a business meeting, etc.). Schuster teaches that,

in another embodiment, the user 220 may use the PID 210
to configure the voice communication device 208 to screen calls based on
priority levels set for individuals for whom the user 220 has provided an
entry in an address book.

(Col. 10, line 65, to col. 11, line 1; emphasis added.)

Thus, the call handling is *provided by the voice communication device*
208. Schuster also teaches that voice communication device 208 is attached to the
network (FIG. 2), but does *not disclose or suggest that voice communication device 208*
is an element of the network. Thus, Schuster does *not* disclose or suggest that the
20 priorities are utilized for *configuring a network*, and does *not* disclose or suggest that the
priorities are utilized for *configuring a network to assign a higher priority to the*
network information when the network information is assigned to one or more preferred
groups, as would be apparent to a person of ordinary skill in the art.

In any case, contrary to the Examiner’s assertion, a person of ordinary
25 skill in the art would *not* have combined the cited references to “reduce latency by
improving priority scheduling,” since the priority disclosed by Schuster is *not* related to
priority scheduling that effects network latency, as defined in the art. Independent claims
1, 21, and 36 require configuring a network to assign a higher priority to the network
information when the network information is assigned to one or more preferred groups,
30 independent claims 14, 29, and 44 require configuring a network to assign a higher
priority to network information assigned to the individual when the prioritization

privilege indicates that the network information belongs to a preferred group, and independent claims 17, 32, and 47 require determining if an individual belongs to one or more preferred groups; marking network information associated with the individual with a priority label; and configuring a network to assign a higher priority, as compared to
5 network information not marked with a priority label, to the marked network information.

Thus, Anderson and Schuster, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest configuring a network to assign a higher priority to the network information when the network information is assigned to one or more preferred groups, as required by independent claims 1, 21, and 36, do not disclose or suggest configuring a network to
10 assign a higher priority to network information assigned to the individual when the prioritization privilege indicates that the network information belongs to a preferred group, as required by independent claims 14, 29, and 44, and do not disclose or suggest determining if an individual belongs to one or more preferred groups; marking network information associated with the individual with a priority label; and configuring a
15 network to assign a higher priority, as compared to network information not marked with a priority label, to the marked network information, as required by independent claims 17, 32, and 47.

Claims 2, 22 and 37

The Examiner asserts that Anderson discloses the step of marking the
20 network information assigned to one or more of the preferred groups with a label, the label indicating that the network information is assigned to a preferred group. Appellants could find *no* disclosure or suggestion of the step of *marking the network information assigned to one or more of the preferred groups with a label*, the label indicating that the network information is assigned to a preferred group in Paragraph 0047 of Anderson.

25 Thus, Anderson and Schuster, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the step of marking the network information assigned to one or more of the preferred groups with a label, the label indicating that the network information is assigned to a preferred group, as required by claims 2, 22 and 37.

Claims 3, 23 and 38

The Examiner asserts that Anderson discloses the step of transmitting the network information assigned to one or more of the preferred groups before previously received network information is sent, the previously received network information not assigned to one or more of the preferred groups. Appellants could find *no* disclosure or suggestion of the step of *transmitting the network information assigned to one or more of the preferred groups before previously received network information is sent*, the previously received network information not assigned to one or more of the preferred groups in Paragraph 0157 of Anderson.

Thus, Anderson and Schuster, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the step of transmitting the network information assigned to one or more of the preferred groups before previously received network information is sent, the previously received network information not assigned to one or more of the preferred groups, as required by claims 3, 23, and 38.

Claim 4

The Examiner asserts that Anderson discloses the step of assigning priority of information within a queue, wherein the queue comprises additional network information that does not have the label and that was received before the network information having the label, and wherein the network information having the label is assigned higher priority than the additional network information. Appellants could find *no* disclosure or suggestion of the step of assigning priority of information within a queue, *wherein the queue comprises additional network information that does not have the label and that was received before the network information having the label, and wherein the network information having the label is assigned higher priority than the additional network information* in Paragraph 0183 of Anderson.

Thus, Anderson and Schuster, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the step of assigning priority of information within a queue, wherein the queue comprises additional network information that does not have the label and that was received before the network information having the label, and wherein the network information having the label is assigned higher priority than the additional network

information, as required by claim 4.

Claim 5

The Examiner asserts that Anderson discloses the step of transmitting, based on the priority, the network information having the label before the additional
5 network information, which does not have the label, is transmitted. Appellants could find *no* disclosure or suggestion of the step of transmitting, *based on the priority*, the *network information having the label before the additional network information*, which does not have the label, is transmitted in Paragraph 0183 of Anderson.

Thus, Anderson and Schuster, alone or in combination, do not disclose or
10 suggest the step of transmitting, based on the priority, the network information having the label before the additional network information, which does not have the label, is transmitted, as required by claim 5.

Claims 7, 24 and 39

The Examiner asserts that Anderson discloses the steps of determining if
15 the network information assigned to one or more of the preferred groups is being routed to or from an application running on a server; and increasing resources of the application when the application is running on a server and when the network information assigned to one or more of the preferred groups is assigned to a preferred group. Appellants could find *no* disclosure or suggestion of the steps of determining if the network information
20 assigned to one or more of the preferred groups is being routed to or from an application running on a server; and *increasing resources of the application when the application is running on a server and when the network information assigned to one or more of the preferred groups is assigned to a preferred group* in Paragraphs 0226-0227 of Anderson.

Thus, Anderson and Schuster, alone or in combination, do not disclose or
25 suggest the steps of determining if the network information assigned to one or more of the preferred groups is being routed to or from an application running on a server; and increasing resources of the application when the application is running on a server and when the network information assigned to one or more of the preferred groups is assigned to a preferred group, as required by claims 7, 24, and 39.

30

Claims 8, 25 and 40

The Examiner asserts that Anderson discloses assigning network information to a preferred group when the user belongs to a preferred group. Appellants could find *no* disclosure or suggestion of *assigning network information to a preferred group when the user belongs to a preferred group* in Paragraph 0040 of Anderson.

Thus, Anderson and Schuster, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest assigning network information to a preferred group when the user belongs to a preferred group, as required by claims 8, 25, and 40.

Claim 9

The Examiner asserts that Anderson discloses wherein the step of assigning network information to a preferred group when the user belongs to a preferred group further comprises the step of assigning network information to a preferred group when the user belongs to the preferred group and when the user is using an application for a preferred purpose. Appellants could find *no* disclosure or suggestion of wherein the step of assigning network information to a preferred group when the user belongs to a preferred group further comprises the step of *assigning network information to a preferred group when the user belongs to the preferred group and when the user is using an application for a preferred purpose* in Paragraph 0237 of Anderson.

Thus, Anderson and Schuster, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest wherein the step of assigning network information to a preferred group when the user belongs to a preferred group further comprises the step of assigning network information to a preferred group when the user belongs to the preferred group and when the user is using an application for a preferred purpose, as required by claim 9.

Claims 12, 27 and 42

The Examiner asserts that Anderson discloses the steps of determining, at a firewall, if an application is to be blocked; and blocking network information from or to the application unless the network information is assigned to a preferred group. Appellants could find *no* disclosure or suggestion of the steps of determining, at a firewall, if an application is to be blocked; and *blocking network information from or to the application unless the network information is assigned to a preferred group* in

Paragraph 0216 of Anderson.

Thus, Anderson and Schuster, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the steps of determining, at a firewall, if an application is to be blocked; and blocking network information from or to the application unless the network information
5 is assigned to a preferred group, as required by claims 12, 27, and 42.

Claims 13, 28 and 43

The Examiner asserts that Anderson discloses determining that the network information belongs to a preferred group when the input biometric data matches the stored biometric data. Appellants could find *no* disclosure or suggestion of
10 *determining that the network information belongs to a preferred group when the input biometric data matches the stored biometric data* in Paragraph 0108 of Anderson.

Thus, Anderson and Schuster, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest determining that the network information belongs to a preferred group when the input biometric data matches the stored biometric data, as required by claims 13, 28, and
15 43.

Claims 16, 31 and 46

The Examiner asserts that Anderson discloses wherein the step of configuring further comprises marking the network information with a label, which indicates that the network information belongs to a preferred group, when the
20 prioritization privilege indicates that the network information belongs to a preferred group. Appellants could find *no* disclosure or suggestion of wherein the step of configuring further comprises *marking the network information with a label*, which indicates that the network information belongs to a preferred group, when the prioritization privilege indicates that the network information belongs to a preferred
25 group in Paragraph 0235 of Anderson.

Thus, Anderson and Schuster, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest wherein the step of configuring further comprises marking the network information with a label, which indicates that the network information belongs to a preferred group, when the prioritization privilege indicates that the network information
30 belongs to a preferred group, as required by claims 16, 31, and 46.

Claims 19, 34 and 49

The Examiner asserts that Anderson discloses determining, when the individual exists in the database, if the priority privilege indicates that network information associated with the individual is to be prioritized. Appellants could find *no* disclosure or suggestion of determining, *when the individual exists in the database, if the priority privilege indicates that network information associated with the individual is to be prioritized* in Paragraph 0040 of Anderson.

Thus, Anderson and Schuster, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest determining, when the individual exists in the database, if the priority privilege indicates that network information associated with the individual is to be prioritized, as required by claims 19, 34, and 49.

Conclusion

The rejections of the cited claims under section 103 in view of Anderson and Schuster, alone or in combination, are therefore believed to be improper and should be withdrawn. The remaining rejected dependent claims are believed allowable for at least the reasons identified above with respect to the independent claims.

The attention of the Examiner and the Appeal Board to this matter is appreciated.

20

Respectfully,

/ Kevin M. Mason/

25 Date: December 27, 2007

Kevin M. Mason
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 36,597
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
1300 Post Road, Suite 205
Fairfield, CT 06824
(203) 255-6560

30

APPENDIX

1. A method for prioritization of a network for one or more preferred groups, the method comprising the steps of:
 - 5 a) determining if network information is assigned to one or more preferred groups; and
 - b) configuring a network to assign a higher priority to the network information when the network information is assigned to one or more preferred groups, the higher priority being relative to network information not assigned to one or more
10 preferred groups.
2. The method of claim 1, wherein step (b) further comprises the step of marking the network information assigned to one or more of the preferred groups with a label, the label indicating that the network information is assigned to a preferred group.
15
3. The method of claim 2:
further comprising the step of receiving the network information;
wherein step (a) further comprises the step of determining that the network information assigned to one or more of the preferred groups comprises the label; and
20 wherein step (b) further comprises the step of transmitting the network information assigned to one or more of the preferred groups before previously received network information is sent, the previously received network information not assigned to one or more of the preferred groups.
- 25 4. The method of claim 2:
further comprising the step of receiving the network information;
wherein step (a) further comprises the step of determining that the network information assigned to one or more of the preferred groups comprises the label; and
wherein step (b) further comprises the step of assigning priority of
30 information within a queue, wherein the queue comprises additional network information

that does not have the label and that was received before the network information having the label, and wherein the network information having the label is assigned higher priority than the additional network information.

5 5. The method of claim 4, wherein step (b) further comprises the step of transmitting, based on the priority, the network information having the label before the additional network information, which does not have the label, is transmitted.

6. The method of claim 2:
10 further comprising the step of receiving the network information;
 wherein step (a) further comprises the step of determining that the network information assigned to one or more of the preferred groups comprises the label; and
 wherein step (b) further comprises the steps of:
 determining if there is a fast path over which the network
15 information assigned to one or more of the preferred groups can be sent;
 and
 transmitting the network information assigned to one or more of the preferred groups over the fast path when there is a fast path.

20 7. The method of claim 1, wherein step (b) further comprises the steps of:
 determining if the network information assigned to one or more of the preferred groups is being routed to or from an application running on a server; and
 increasing resources of the application when the application is running on a server and when the network information assigned to one or more of the preferred
25 groups is assigned to a preferred group.

8. The method of claim 1, wherein step (a) further comprises the steps of:
 identifying a user;
 determining if a user belongs to a preferred group; and
30 assigning network information to a preferred group when the user belongs

to a preferred group.

9. The method of claim 8:

5 wherein step (a) further comprises the step of determining, when the user does belong to a preferred group, if the user is using an application for a preferred purpose; and

10 wherein the step of assigning network information to a preferred group when the user belongs to a preferred group further comprises the step of assigning network information to a preferred group when the user belongs to the preferred group and when the user is using an application for a preferred purpose.

10. The method of claim 8 wherein the step of assigning network information to a preferred group when the user belongs to a preferred group further comprises marking the network information with a label, indicating that the network information is
15 assigned to a preferred group, when the user belongs to a preferred group.

11. The method of claim 1, wherein the preferred groups comprise one or more of people with disabilities and medical professionals.

20 12. The method of claim 1, wherein step (b) further comprises the steps of:
determining, at a firewall, if an application is to be blocked; and
blocking network information from or to the application unless the network information is assigned to a preferred group.

25 13. The method of claim 1, wherein step (a) further comprises the steps of:
comparing input biometric data from an individual with stored biometric data in a database;
determining if the input biometric data matches the stored biometric data;
and
30 determining that the network information belongs to a preferred group

when the input biometric data matches the stored biometric data.

14. A method for prioritization of networks for preferred groups, the method comprising the steps of:

- 5 requesting a prioritization privilege of an individual;
determining, by accessing a database, the prioritization privilege of the individual; and
configuring a network to assign a higher priority to network information assigned to the individual when the prioritization privilege indicates that the network
10 information belongs to a preferred group.

15. The method of claim 14, wherein the prioritization privilege comprises one or more of dates of use information, prioritization level information, and purpose information.

15

16. The method of claim 14, wherein the step of configuring further comprises marking the network information with a label, which indicates that the network information belongs to a preferred group, when the prioritization privilege indicates that the network information belongs to a preferred group.

20

17. A method for prioritization of a network for one or more preferred groups, the method comprising the steps of:

- determining if an individual belongs to one or more preferred groups;
marking network information associated with the individual with a priority
25 label; and
configuring a network to assign a higher priority, as compared to network information not marked with a priority label, to the marked network information.

18. The method of claim 17, wherein the step of marking network information
30 associated with the individual with a priority label comprises the step of marking network

information produced by an application the individual is using with a priority label.

19. The method of claim 17, wherein the step of determining if an individual belongs to one or more preferred groups comprises the steps of:

5 determining if the individual exists in a database that comprises the one or more preferred groups;

determining a priority privilege of the individual when the individual exists in the database; and

10 determining, when the individual exists in the database, if the priority privilege indicates that network information associated with the individual is to be prioritized.

20. The method of claim 19, wherein the step of determining if an individual exists in a database that comprises the one or more preferred groups comprises the steps of:

15 determining if biometric data entered by the individual matches biometric data for a person in the database; and

determining that the person is the individual and that the individual exists in the database when the biometric data entered by the individual matches biometric data for a person in the database.

21. A system for prioritization of a network for one or more preferred groups, the system comprising:

25 a memory that stores computer-readable code; and
a processor operatively coupled to the memory, the processor configured to implement the computer-readable code, the computer-readable code configured to:

a) determine if network information is assigned to one or more preferred groups; and

30 b) configure a network to assign a higher priority to the network information when the network information is assigned to one or more preferred groups,

the higher priority being relative to network information not assigned to one or more preferred groups.

22. The system of claim 21, wherein the computer-readable code is further
5 configured, when performing step (b), to mark the network information assigned to one or more of the preferred groups with a label, the label indicating that the network information is assigned to a preferred group.

23. The system of claim 22:
10 wherein the computer-readable code is further configured to receive the network information;

wherein the computer-readable code is further configured, when performing step (a), to determine that the network information assigned to one or more of the preferred groups comprises the label; and

15 wherein the computer-readable code is further configured, when performing step (b), to transmit the network information assigned to one or more of the preferred groups before previously received network information is sent, the previously received network information not assigned to one or more of the preferred groups.

20 24. The system of claim 21, wherein the computer-readable code is further configured, when performing step (b), to:

determine if the network information assigned to one or more of the preferred groups is being routed to or from an application running on a server; and

25 increase resources of the application when the application is running on a server and when the network information assigned to one or more of the preferred groups is assigned to a preferred group.

25. The system of claim 21, wherein the computer-readable code is further configured, when performing step (a), to:

30 identify a user;

determine if a user belongs to a preferred group; and
assign network information to a preferred group when the user belongs to
a preferred group.

5 26. The system of claim 21, wherein the preferred groups comprise one or
more of people with disabilities and medical professionals.

27. The system of claim 21, wherein the computer-readable code is further
configured, when performing step (b), to:
10 determine, at a firewall, if an application is to be blocked; and
block network information from or to the application unless the network
information is assigned to a preferred group.

28. The system of claim 21, wherein the computer-readable code is further
15 configured, when performing step (a), to:
compare input biometric data from an individual with stored biometric
data in a database;
determine if the input biometric data matches the stored biometric data;
and
20 determine that the network information belongs to a preferred group when
the input biometric data matches the stored biometric data.

29. A system for prioritization of a network for one or more preferred groups,
the system comprising:
25 a memory that stores computer-readable code; and
a processor operatively coupled to the memory, the processor configured
to implement the computer-readable code, the computer-readable code configured to:
request a prioritization privilege of an individual;
determine, by accessing a database, the prioritization privilege of the
30 individual; and

configure a network to assign a higher priority to network information assigned to the individual when the prioritization privilege indicates that the network information belongs to a preferred group.

5 30. The system of claim 29, wherein the prioritization privilege comprises one or more of dates of use information, prioritization level information, and purpose information.

10 31. The system of claim 29, wherein the computer-readable code is further configured, when configuring a network, to mark the network information with a label, which indicates that the network information belongs to a preferred group, when the prioritization privilege indicates that the network information belongs to a preferred group.

15 32. A system for prioritization of a network for one or more preferred groups, the system comprising:

 a memory that stores computer-readable code; and
 a processor operatively coupled to the memory, the processor configured to implement the computer-readable code, the computer-readable code configured to:
20 determine if an individual belongs to one or more preferred groups;
 mark network information associated with the individual with a priority label; and

 configure a network to assign a higher priority, as compared to network information not marked with a priority label, to the marked network information.

25 33. The system of claim 32, wherein the computer-readable code is further configured, when marking network information associated with the individual with a priority label, to mark network information produced by an application the individual is using with a priority label.

30

34. The system of claim 32, wherein the computer-readable code is further configured, when determining if an individual belongs to one or more preferred groups, to:

5 determine if the individual exists in a database that comprises the one or more preferred groups;

determine a priority privilege of the individual when the individual exists in the database; and

10 determine, when the individual exists in the database, if the priority privilege indicates that network information associated with the individual is to be prioritized.

35. The system of claim 34, wherein the computer-readable code is further configured, when determining if an individual exists in a database that comprises the one or more preferred groups, to:

15 determine if biometric data entered by the individual matches biometric data for a person in the database; and

determine that the person is the individual and that the individual exists in the database when the biometric data entered by the individual matches biometric data for a person in the database.

20

36. An article of manufacture comprising:

a computer-readable medium having computer-readable code means embodied thereon, the computer-readable code means comprising:

25 a) a step to determine if network information is assigned to one or more preferred groups; and

b) a step to configure a network to assign a higher priority to the network information when the network information is assigned to one or more preferred groups, the higher priority being relative to network information not assigned to one or more preferred groups.

30

37. The article of manufacture of claim 36, wherein the computer-readable code means further comprises, when performing step (b), a step to mark the network information assigned to one or more of the preferred groups with a label, the label indicating that the network information is assigned to a preferred group.

5

38. The article of manufacture of claim 36:
wherein the computer-readable code means further comprises a step to receive the network information;

wherein the computer-readable code means further comprises, when
10 performing step (a), a step to determine that the network information assigned to one or more of the preferred groups comprises the label; and

wherein the computer-readable code means further comprises, when
performing step (b), a step to transmit the network information assigned to one or more of
the preferred groups before previously received network information is sent, the
15 previously received network information not assigned to one or more of the preferred groups.

39. The article of manufacture of claim 36, wherein the computer-readable code means further comprises, when performing step (b):

20 a step to determine if the network information assigned to one or more of the preferred groups is being routed to or from an application running on a server; and

a step to increase resources of the application when the application is running on a server and when the network information assigned to one or more of the preferred groups is assigned to a preferred group.

25

40. The article of manufacture of claim 36, wherein the computer-readable code means further comprises, when performing step (a):

a step to identify a user;

a step to determine if a user belongs to a preferred group; and

30 assign network information to a preferred group when the user belongs to

a preferred group.

41. The article of manufacture of claim 36, wherein the preferred groups comprise one or more of people with disabilities and medical professionals.

5

42. The article of manufacture of claim 36, wherein the computer-readable code means further comprises, when performing step (b):

a step to determine, at a firewall, if an application is to be blocked; and

a step to block network information from or to the application unless the
10 network information is assigned to a preferred group.

43. The article of manufacture of claim 36, wherein the computer-readable code means further comprises, when performing step (a):

a step to compare input biometric data from an individual with stored
15 biometric data in a database;

a step to determine if the input biometric data matches the stored biometric data; and

a step to determine that the network information belongs to a preferred group when the input biometric data matches the stored biometric data.

20

44. An article of manufacture comprising:

a computer-readable medium having computer-readable code means embodied thereon, the computer-readable code means comprising:

a step to request a prioritization privilege of an individual;

determine, by accessing a database, the prioritization privilege of the
25 individual; and

configure a network to assign a higher priority to network information assigned to the individual when the prioritization privilege indicates that the network information belongs to a preferred group.

30

45. The article of manufacture of claim 44, wherein the prioritization privilege comprises one or more of dates of use information, prioritization level information, and purpose information.

5 46. The article of manufacture of claim 44, wherein the computer-readable code means further comprises, when configuring, a step to mark the network information with a label, which indicates that the network information belongs to a preferred group, when the prioritization privilege indicates that the network information belongs to a preferred group.

10

47. An article of manufacture comprising:
a computer-readable medium having computer-readable code means embodied thereon, the computer-readable code means comprising:
determine if an individual belongs to one or more preferred groups;
15 mark network information associated with the individual with a priority label; and
configure a network to assign a higher priority, as compared to network information not marked with a priority label, to the marked network information.

20 48. The article of manufacture of claim 47, wherein the computer-readable code means further comprises, when marking network information associated with the individual with a priority label, a step to mark network information produced by an application the individual is using with a priority label.

25 49. The article of manufacture of claim 47, wherein the computer-readable code means further comprises, when determining if an individual belongs to one or more preferred groups:

a step to determine if the individual exists in a database that comprises the one or more preferred groups;

30 a step to determine a priority privilege of the individual when the

individual exists in the database; and

a step to determine, when the individual exists in the database, if the priority privilege indicates that network information associated with the individual is to be prioritized.

5

50. The article of manufacture of claim 49, wherein the computer-readable code means further comprises, when determining if an individual exists in a database that comprises the one or more preferred groups:

a step to determine if biometric data entered by the individual matches
10 biometric data for a person in the database; and

a step to determine that the person is the individual and that the individual exists in the database when the biometric data entered by the individual matches biometric data for a person in the database.

EVIDENCE APPENDIX

There is no evidence submitted pursuant to § 1.130, 1.131, or 1.132 or entered by the Examiner and relied upon by appellant.

RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

There are no known decisions rendered by a court or the Board in any proceeding identified pursuant to paragraph (c)(1)(ii) of 37 CFR 41.37.